Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
DEC 2 1 2007
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

(3)

No. 07-399

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

TAWOOS BAZARGANI,

Petitioner,

v.

KENNETH and JACQUELINE SNYDER,
and PAUL BAGHERPOUR,

Respondents.

On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari
To The United States Court Of Appeals
For The Third Circuit

PETITION FOR REHEARING

TAWOOS BAZARGANI, M.D., Pro Se
40 Old Lancaster Road
Merion, PA 19066
215-551-3135

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether opinion below departed from the accepted and usual course of Judicial proceedings and therefore necessitated the United States Supreme Court's supervision because its ruling conflicts with this court's prior rulings upon a crime committed by the plaintiffs and the witness because of their inconsistent statements while under oath and because it has deprived the litigant defendant from her due process rights to a fair, impartial trial where defendant could have proceeded her defense against the instant religious discrimination claim to its merits?

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Petitioner Tawoos Bazargani, M.D. hereby moves to file this Petition For Rehearing in the above identified claim which follows the Petition For Certiorari. The Petition For Certiorari has been denied on November 26, 2007.

The instant claim **has been merely based upon conversation** held between plaintiffs, co-defendant Mr. Paul Bagherpour (hereinafter "Mr. Bagherpour") and an attorney Mr. Larry Ceisler, Esquire who has been called by plaintiffs immediately after the conversation between Bagherpour and plaintiff in order to perform an interrogation upon Mr. Bagherpour (see trial transcript, Pg. 2.48). Then Mr. Larry Ceisler, Esquire immediately after has performed an interrogation, on the behalf of plaintiffs, upon Mr. Bagherpour and has documented an Affidavit based upon this conversation which has been filed by plaintiffs in order to substantiate plaintiffs' claim all along the proceeding of the instant claim (see Affidavit App. Pg. 77). Defendant Dr. Bazargani is an innocent bystander and plaintiffs has held Dr. Bazargani liable because of those quoted about the above documented conversation between above documented persons. Following a Jury trial on June 16, 2005 **a verdict was issued against defendants which has been based on creditability of the parties** (see the verdict).

In proceeding the instant claim, on an increasing basis, it has become evident that there has been inconsistency in testimonies of Mr. Larry Ceisler Esquire as well as plaintiffs while under oath (see plaintiff Kenneth Snyder's deposition, Pg. 67). Mr. Larry Ceisler Esquire who has claimed being an attorney and has filed an Affidavit following performing an interrogation upon co-defendant Mr. Bagherpour, while in the hearing before the Arbitrators and under oath, in response to having a Bar Number, he has testified that "It never got to that point." On a total contradiction to his testimony before the Arbitrators, during de novo hearing, which followed the Arbitration, while under oath, he has testified of being an attorney and having a Bar Number (see trial transcript Pgs. 1.83-1.84). This inconsistency in his testimony has recently reached its climax by a produced Bar Number as "47980."

Considering the verdict being based on creditability of the parties it has become of utmost significance for defendant Dr. Bazargani that to continue this investigation to its real truth, **consequently, defendant has directed a Request For Clarification to American Bar Association in rectifying the truth involving Mr. Larry Ceisler, Esquire's participation in Bar Examination, therefore, being honored with a Bar Number**. It is self-explanatory that the result of American Bar Association will have controlling effect upon the result of this claim.

The United States Court Of Appeals For The Third Circuit in its opinion and its ruling involving inconsistent testimonies of plaintiffs and Larry Ceisler Esquire, while under oath, has not been justifiable for the following reasons: A – The ruling has ignored about the verdict being based on creditability of the parties; B – It has basically ruled that plaintiffs can be awarded with $90,000.00 award, even though, there has been inconsistency in testimonies of plaintiffs and Larry Ceisler Esquire while under oath; C – Finally the Third Circuit documents nothing about the fact of facing the justice if plaintiffs and Larry Ceisler Esquire have not said the truth while Under oath a crime which is enable to cancel the election outcome to a United States President (a copy of the third Circuit's Opinion has been attached to the Writ of Certiorari).

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, of the United States Supreme court, rules that a Petition for Rehearing of any order denying the petition for Writ of Certiorari can be filed pursuant to Rule 44.2 which rules that the ground for a Petition for Rehearing should be limited to intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or other substantial grounds not previously presented, see Massey v. United States, 291 U.S. 608 (1934); Sioux Tribe v. United States, 329 U.S. 684 (1946).

Respectfully submitted,

TAWOOS BAZARGANI, M.D., Pro Se
40 Old Lancaster Road
Merion, PA 19066
215-551-3135

CERTIFICATE OF GOOD FAITH

Petitioner Tawoos Bazargani, M.D. hereby certifies that the instant Petition For Rehearing has been filed in good faith and for good cause which is self-explanatory and the context speaks for itself.

_____

TAWOOS BAZARGANI, M.D.